U.S.S.N. 10/605,733

AUG-16-2005 16:01

2

## REMARKS

In the Office Action of May 18, 2005, claims 1-2 and 4-20 are pending. Claims 1, 19, and 20 are independent claims from which all other claims depend therefrom. Applicants recognize the allowability of claims 9 and 12 if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. However, Applicants believe that independent claim 1 is allowable in view of the relied upon reference referred to in the Office Action and thus, also believe that claims 9 and 12 are allowable as originally drafted.

Claims 1-2, 4-8, 10, and 13-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gloutsos et al. (U.S. 5,446,661).

Claim 1 recites the limitations of a controller that is coupled to a beamforming assembly and an object detection sensor. The controller adjusts the
illumination output of the light source in response to the object detection signal.
In adjusting the illumination output, the controller adjusts an illumination
parameter selected from at least one of beam pattern, beam location, beam focus,
and beam angle.

The Office Action states that Gloutsos discloses the stated limitations. Applicants, respectfully, traverse. Gloutsos discloses a discrimination system for detection of occupant position. Gloutsos, in general, discloses four different embodiments, which are illustrated in Figures 2, 3-5, and 7. All of the embodiments utilize a laser and one or more of each of an optic, a beam splitter, and a detector. The laser, the optic, the beam splitter, and the detector are stationary or fixed in a single location and orientation. The light generated from the laser is generated and emitted at a predetermined modulation frequency. The light is directed horizontally at an expected position where a vehicle occupant may be located.

Nowhere in Gloutsos is the pattern, the location, the focus, or the angle of the light beam adjusted by a controller or any other device of the system. The angle of the light beam is dependent only on the reflection thereof off of the vehicle occupant. The characteristics and location of the vehicle occupant affect

3

the angle at which the light beam is reflected. This angle is determined by the system of Gloutsos, but is not adjusted. Gloutsos determines position of the occupant in response to the angle.

Nowhere in Gloutsos is beam pattern, location, and focus mentioned, disclosed, or suggested. Gloutsos only discloses reflective beam angle and how that reflective angle is measured. Gloutsos also states that the reflected beam angle changes with change in occupant position. However, alteration of beam angle by change in occupant characteristics or position is not claimed.

In addition, nowhere in Gloutsos is it stated that a controller is provided that adjusts beam pattern, beam location, beam focus, and beam angle. The processor 26 of Gloutsos is used to determine when deployment of a safety restraint is required based on the occupant characteristics detected. The processor 26 does not adjust the transmission of the light beam 34. The processor 26 is not even coupled to the modulator 14 or the optical transmitter 16 and therefore clearly is incapable of performing such adjustment. See Figure 1 of Gloutsos.

Thus, each and every element of claim 1 is not taught or suggested by Gloutsos.

Claim 19 recites the limitations of a receiver that receives a second communication signal generated from an object in response to a first communication signal. A controller is coupled to a beam-forming assembly and a receiver and adjusts the illumination beam in response to the second communication signal.

Nowhere in Gloutsos is it stated that an object generates a communication signal. In Gloutsos a light beam is reflected off of a vehicle occupant. The vehicle occupant does not generate the reflected light beam.

Also, as stated above, the processor 26 of Gloutsos does not adjust the light beam. The processor of Gloutsos is not even coupled to modulator 14 or the optical transmitter 16. Thus, Gloutsos fails to teach or suggest a controller that

P.05/06

81092183 (FGT 1840 PA)

U.S.S.N. 10/605,733

adjusts an illumination beam in response to a communication signal generated from an object.

Claim 20 recites the limitation of detecting a communication signal generated from an object, which as stated above is not disclosed by Gloutsos. Claim 20 also recites the limitation of adjusting illumination output of a vehicle headlight system in response to the communication signal. Applicants submit that Gloutsos does not even disclose a vehicle headlight, let alone adjustment thereof. The only illumination device disclosed by Gloutsos is a laser for the vehicle internal detection of a vehicle occupant. A "headlight" refers to an illumination device that is used to illuminate an area external and forward of a vehicle.

Thus, Cloutsos fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation of claim 20.

In order for a reference to anticipate a claim the reference must teach or suggest each and every element of that claim, see MPEP 2131 and Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628. Thus, since each and every element of claims 1, 19, and 20 are not taught or suggested by Gloutsos, Applicants submit that claims 1, 19, and 20 are novel, nonobvious, and are in a condition for allowance. Also, since claims 2 and 4-20 depend from claims 1, 19, and 20, respectively, they are also novel, nonobvious, and are in a condition for allowance for at least the same reasons.

P.06/06

U.S.S.N. 10/605,733

Dated: August 16, 2005

5

81092183 (FGT 1840 PA)

In light of the remarks, Applicants submit that all the rejections are now overcome. The application is now in condition for allowance and expeditious notice thereof is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

ARTZ & ARTZ P.C.

28333 Telegraph Road, Suite 250

Southfield, MI 48034

(248) 223-9500